



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,544	09/30/2003	Anthony J. Gounalis	L0562.70043US00	5969

7590 08/30/2004

Randy J. Pritzker  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
600 Atlantic Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210

EXAMINER

GREGORY, BERNARR E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3662

DATE MAILED: 08/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/675,544	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOUNALIS, ANTHONY J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bernarr E. Gregory	<b>Art Unit</b> 3662	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

1. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of independent claims 1 and 12 and elsewhere throughout dependent claims 2-11 and 13-22, the uses of the term "emitter signal" are indefinite and unclear in context in that it is not made clear in either the claims or the specification what sort of signal is in view. The context of the application seems to indicate that the "emitter signal" is a radar or a radio signal. In response to this rejection, Applicant is required to clarify for the record what the "emitter signal" is.

In each of dependent claims 5-7 and 16-18, the uses of the term "illumination times" are indefinite and unclear in context in that there is no definition of this term in the Specification. Does this "time" refer to an ordinary clock time (e.g., 2:38 PM), to a time interval of illumination, or to something else?

Dependent claims 2-11 and 13-22 are unclear in that they depend from unclear independent claims 1 and 12.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Garcia et al ('770).

The first method step recited in independent claim 1 is met by the determining of "relative positions of the transceivers" (lines 9-10 of the Abstract) and/or the inferring by the "statistical unit" (lines 10-11 of the Abstract). The second method step of claim 1 is met by the forming of "a composite received signal model" (line 11 of the Abstract). The third method step of independent claim 1 is met by the use of the "composite received signal model" in interference and threshold processing (e.g., see lines 9-18 of the Abstract).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia et al ('770).

Garcia et al ('770) differs from the limitations of independent claim 12 in that the method in Garcia et al ('770) is not disclosed as being in the form of a computer program product, as in claim 12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill-in-the-art that the processing method of Garcia et al ('770) is susceptible of being implemented in a computer or processor as software and that the most efficient way of distributing such software would be as a computer program product, where the software resides on the old and well-known computer-readable medium.

The first computer-implemented method step recited in independent claim 12 is met by the determining of "relative positions of the transceivers" (lines 9-10 of the Abstract) and/or the inferring by the "statistical unit" (lines 10-11 of the Abstract). The second computer-implemented method step of claim 12 is met by the forming of "a composite received signal model" (line 11 of the Abstract). The third computer-implemented method step of independent claim 12 is met by the use of the "composite received signal model" in interference and threshold processing (e.g., see lines 9-18 of the Abstract).

6. Claims 2-11 and 13-22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernarr E. Gregory whose telephone number is (703) 306-5765. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas H. Tarcza, can be reached on (703) 306-4171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 3662

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bernarr E. Gregory", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Bernarr E. Gregory  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3662